

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES – May 3, 2017

Members Attending

Alphonse Smith, Arts Council, AC
Daniel McElmurray, PPW
Eleanor Burke, HDLC
Miriam Lemann, CPA
Tim Jackson, CPC
William Gilchrist, Place-Based Planning, PBP

Presenters/Guests (*See sign in sheets at the end of the meeting minutes)

Danielle Duke, Dana Brown & Associates
Curtis Lamb, Gould Evans
Martin Tovrea, Gould Evans
Richard Albert, Albert Architecture
Daniel Zegel, Albert Architecture
Anna Labadie, GCHP
Todd James, Mathes Brierre
Erin Porter, Mathes Brierre
Bryan Parks, Lionfield, Hunter & James, Inc.

1. **Consideration**: Minutes from April 19, 2017, DAC meeting.

There was no discussion.

Motion: A motion for **Approval** of the minutes was made by HDLC, seconded by PPW and adopted.

CPC Items:

2. **Reconsideration**: **ZONING DOCKET 029-16** - Conversion of a church into a 20-unit multi-family dwelling for a planned development in the enhancement corridor design overlay with more than 100 feet of frontage. (deferred from the meetings March 22, 2016) (NJ)
Location: 131 S. Jefferson Davis Parkway
Submitted by: Richard Albert, Albert Architecture
Contact: dzegel@albert-architecture.com

CPC staff explained that the project had been presented previously at the March 22 and that the applicant had submitted revised plans. The previous issues included the preservation of a

live oak tree, no screening of the large parking area and a proviso to maintain the existing street wall.

The applicant provided a brief overview of the property, explaining that the location was a historical church that was being turned into a 20-unit condo. Addressing the previous problems, the applicant mentioned that after discussions with their civil engineer and architect that they were preserving the oak tree by moving the driveway entrance and that they were providing a low site wall to screen the parking lot. They are also were working with SHPO to preserve the large atrium. New additions include a 2-unit penthouse on the rear of the building.

The representative from HDLC was satisfied with the changes for the previous issues. The representative from PPW said that the landscape did not meet requirements, pointing out the need for 3 live oaks on Jefferson Davis, 6 small ornamental trees on Cleveland and there needed to be a tree preservation and protection plan. The representative from PBP asked what the siding was for both the new penthouse addition and the original. The applicant responding that the original was stucco and the addition was hardy panel. The representative from PBP felt that they addition was problematic, that it did not tie in with the rest of the building both in façade and window placement and size. He suggested they revisit it for the rhythm to make it cohesive. The representative from HDLC suggested using stucco for the addition, and the representative from PBP suggested that the addition's windows line up to work with the original windows. The representative from PPW requested that they submit a landscape plan, tree preservation/protection plan and that construction around the existing live oak be done with an air spade not a back hoe.

Motion: A motion for **Approval** of the project was made by PBP, subject to submission of landscape plans and revisit of the façade materials and window placement on addition, seconded by PPW and adopted.

3. **Consideration: DESIGN REVIEW 043-17** - New construction of a health clinic in the enhancement corridor design overlay with over 40,000 square feet and more than 100 feet of frontage (NK)

Location: 1631 Elysian Fields Avenue

Submitted by: Martin Tovrea, Gould Evans

Contact: Martin.Tovrea@GouldEvans.com, Curtis.Laub@GouldEvans.com

CPC staff introduced the project mentioning that this project had been under review with the BZA and had been approved, and is still under review for a resubdivision. The applicant that the ground floor would be primarily parking, exceeding the minimum CPC requirement, and there would be a slatted gate for security on the garage/parking entrance. There would also hold an elevator for access to the second and third floor. The upper floors would be clinic and administrative space, with admin, IT and community meeting space on the second floor and clinic and legal offices on the third. The materials planned for the project are a greyish taupe brick veneer on the ground floor and a greyish blue hardy board plank on the upper floors. A

perforated fence would be on the Marigny side with ficus on the interior by the parking and the windows would be glazed like the windows at City Hall.

The representative from PBP expressed concern that they plans were too small and that the colors appeared greatly washed out. The applicant passed around the samples and the representatives all expressed concern that they were too washed out. The representative from PPW said that they would become even more washed out in time, and the representative from PBP described it as a large greyish box, stated that he was not comfortable reviewing it, that it looks worse than if it was black and white and that one of the colors need to be very rich and saturated like in the logo. The representative from PPW asked about the live oak on the corner of Elysian Fields, and suggested moving the curb cut away from the base of the tree. The representative from HDLC mentioned that the structure did not respond to the context of the neighborhood which was primarily one story residential and retail. The representative from PPW asked why they were demolishing the building on site and working to expand upon that. The applicant said that this was what the client wanted. The representative from PBP stated that the windows looked like someone pulled out a drawer and didn't push them back all of the way. The representative from PPW suggested putting up a landscape wall on the backside of the property, and stated that they needed three (3) live oaks on Elysian Fields, not sweet magnolias and that there was need on vegetation on Marigny, maybe double planting the border or planting trees on the property line.

Motion: A motion for **Approval** of the project was made by PBP subject to the re-subdivision, landscape and color, seconded by CPA and adopted.

Non-CPC Items:

4. **Consideration:** The Low Barrier Shelter and Engagement Center for New Orleans

Location: 1530 Gravier Street, 2nd Floor

Submitted by: Ann Schmuelling and Erin Porter (Mathes Brierre Architects), Rodney Dionisio (Capital Projects Administration)

Contact: aschmuelling@mathesbrierre.com, eporter@mathesbrierre.com,
radionisio@nola.gov

CPC staff explained that the project. The applicant explained the plans to move the Low Barrier Shelter and Homeless Service Center to the former VA site. The CRRC would be on the 1st floor providing medical support and distribution of food, while the 2nd floor would be the shelter. The applicant mentioned that they had lots of engagement with the adjacent properties to make the project successful and to the approval of the owners of other neighborhood buildings. Plans are to move the entrance to Freret and Gravier.

The representative from PPW asked how many people this would service, to which the applicant replied that there would be 100 beds. The applicant also stated that they plan to provide storage space, about the size of a bike locker, for all on the exterior.

Motion: A motion for **Approval** of the project was made by PBP, seconded by HDLC and adopted.

5. **Consideration:** Taylor Playground

Location: 2601 S. Derbigny Street

Submitted by: Danielle Duhe (Dana Brown Associates), Erika Boerr (CPA)

Contact: dduhe@danabrownassociates.com, eboerr@nola.gov

CPC staff explained the project. The applicant explained that this was a rehabilitation to existing structures at the playground, including the baseball field, multi-use fields, pool, concrete basketball court and playground. The representative from PPW asked if this was a separate contract from CDM. The applicant said yes and the representative said that the plans did not match and that they needed to reconcile the plans. The representative from PBP said that they didn't need to look at what the other plans were, just focus on what was in front of them today, and that this was really just a renovation.

Motion: A motion for **Approval** of the project was made by PPW, seconded by HDLC and adopted.

6. **Consideration:** Kenilworth Playground

Location: 7820 Redfish Street

Submitted by: Miriam Lemann (CPA), Bryan Parks (Linfield, Hunter & Junius)

Contact: mflemann@nola.gov, bparks@lhjunius.com

CPC staff explained the project. The applicant explained that this was a renovation to make the concession stand and restaurant ADA compliant, to repair the fence and sidewalks, again to make them ADA compliant. The representative from CPA asked the representative from PPW if there would be a problem with the sidewalk plans and the existing tree. The representative from PPW suggested that they use flexipave to prevent any problems. He also suggested that they do not paint the flexipave because it is not color stable.

Motion: A motion for **Approval** of the project was made by PBP subject to selection of flexipave with no color, seconded by HDLC and adopted.